

Price (£.6.)

MEDICAL PROGRESS.

A REVISION OF THE PAPER READ AT THE
SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

MARYLAND
HOMCEOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY,

NOVEMBER 10th, 1880.

BY

ELDRIDGE C. PRICE, M.D.

(Reprinted from the *North American Journal of Homoeopathy*, February, 1880.)



PHILADELPHIA: .

GLOBE PRINTING HOUSE, 112 AND 114 NORTH TWELFTH STREET.

1881.

MEDICAL PROGRESS.

A REVISION OF THE PAPER READ AT THE
SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

MARYLAND
HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY,

NOVEMBER 10th, 1880.

BY

ELDRIDGE C. PRICE, M.D.

(Reprinted from the *North American Journal of Homœopathy*, February, 1880.)



PHILADELPHIA:

GLOBE PRINTING HOUSE, 112 AND 114 NORTH TWELFTH STREET.

1881.



PREFACE.

KNOWING that the allopathic fraternity of Baltimore had in course of preparation a report of the progress of medicine in our city since its incorporation as a city, and also being confident that the progress of homœopathy would be ignored, or, if noticed, slightly mentioned, I determined, if I were able, to meet allopathy on its own ground. For which purpose that portion of this paper was written which does not relate immediately to the progress of medicine in the past year.

Finally, this *pamphlet* has been published for the purpose of showing, both the friends and enemies of homœopathy, the inconsistency and harmfulness of practicing medicine without a law.

THE AUTHOR.

MEDICAL PROGRESS.*

ONE hundred and fifty years ago was near the noon of the eighteenth century and forty-six years before the birth of the United States.

For all important progress in medicine at this period we must look beyond the seas.

Here we find nothing transpiring of very great interest, further than the occasional introduction of some drug into general use; a process of accumulation and agglutination that formed the *materia medica*. This took time, a great deal of time; progress was so slow that but little advance was noticeable at that period, from the time of Paul of Egina; and the same prescriptions were used that were compounded by Fabricius ab Aquapendente two centuries before.

One year brought forth on an average, about as much good as another. Occasionally a drug was considered inert and dropped from some compound; or, perhaps, some compound was concocted as a more efficacious substitute for a prescription grown old-fashioned.

The chief improvement was that prescriptions were simplified by using fewer ingredients.

The *Theriaca Andromachi* which originated in the year 1682, and consisted of sixty-one, some say sixty-five, drugs, was less frequently prescribed, though it was occasionally used.

There was, therefore, little progress during this time. Theory, bickerings, and uncertainty, mar the medical history of the eighteenth century.

At its extreme end Samuel Hahnemann hurled a huge intel-

* The annual report of the Historian, read at the Maryland Hom. Med. Soc., Nov. 10th, 1880.

lectual boulder into the sea of medical learning. This wrecked many a full rigged theory, and stranded many a small craft heavily laden with unsound hypotheses.

"Samuel Hahnemann was born in 1755, at Misnia, in Upper Saxony." At forty-one years of age, after having been a profound student of medicine, chemistry, and general science, he set the first star of truth in the firmament of professed medicine,—the first guide to the law of cure. This appeared in the form of an article published in Hufeland's Journal in 1796. Allopathy has said that this great man was a quack. Dr. Hufeland at this time edited one of her leading journals; he was considered an authority and a leader. Well, this renowned man declared Samuel Hahnemann to be "one of the most distinguished of German physicians."

Did our knowledge of his future life cease here, we would feel convinced of Hahnemann's sound judgment. He was no pretender or humbug—his assumption was less than his knowledge,—neither was he an ordinary man, but he was "distinguished."

Samuel Thompson and Samuel Hahnemann were two very different men. Let us therefore hear no more of the falsehoods about the founder of homœopathy being an uneducated man; why it was when translating Cullen's *Materia Medica* into the German language that he caught the first glimmering of the law of cure. Could an uneducated man have translated such a work?

From about the year 1800, then, medical progress begins. In this year was born Constantine Hering.

In 1810 Hahnemann published his "Organon of Homœopathic Medicine." This publication of ideas so antagonistic to the prevailing views of the times, together with other productions, and his constantly increasing practice, excited the old school to such jealousy, indignation and wrath, that in 1820 Hahnemann quitted his native country in disgust at the bigotry, intolerance and persecution of the men upon whom he sought to confer a priceless blessing.

In 1826 the first homœopathic physician, Dr. Graham, landed in New York, and at the same time Dr. Quinn settled in England.

According to Dr. Berridge, of England, two hundred and seventy-five regularly graduated homœopathic physicians is to-day England's full complement; while in this interval of fifty-four years the increase in the United States has been from one to six thousand homœopathic physicians.

In 1833 Dr. Hering came to Philadelphia, and shortly after his arrival he assisted in establishing the first homœopathic school of medicine in America, at Allentown, Pa. Previous to this time there was no homœopathic work written in the English language; being a scholar of no mean accomplishments, it became the task of Constantine Hering to give the first translation of the "Organon."

Other translations by the same author followed, and also various original works upon homœopathy. This was less than fifty years ago; now our books number legion.

Of various institutions we have:—

1 National Society: The American Institute of Homœopathy.

2 Special Societies: The American Homœopathic Ophthalmological and Otological Society, and The Western Academy of Homœopathy.

23 State Societies.

92 Local Societies, *i. e.*, county and city societies.

7 Homœopathic Clubs.

1 Library Association.

1 Homœopathic Insurance Company.

38 Homœopathic Hospitals.

30 Dispensaries.

11 Colleges.

2 Special Schools: The Ophthalmic School, and The School of Midwifery and Diseases of Children.

16 Homœopathic Journals.

7 Homœopathic Directories.

In our own city of Baltimore, the first homœopathic physician, Dr. F. R. McManus, begun the practice of homœopathy in 1837. Previous to this a man practiced homœopathy here for a time, but so little is known of him that to Dr. McManus we accord the distinction of being Baltimore's first pioneer of

homœopathy. From 1837 the number of practitioners gradually increased; in 1865 the number was 15 or 16; since then the increase has been more rapid and to-day we number 38 regularly graduated homœopathic physicians.

In 1874 a city society was organized.

In 1875 our present state society was incorporated, and in 1877 the Baltimore Homœopathic Free Dispensary was incorporated. In conjunction with this there exists an auxillary association of ladies.

Now, let us see if the discovery of the law of cure has affected so-called "scientific medicine."

To retrace our steps and describe every concession allopathy has involuntarily made to our law, would be a herculean task, requiring more time than I have at my disposal for writing, and more patience than you have at your command for hearing, such a compilation.

Newton discovered the law of gravitation and opened a wide field for philosophy; Columbus discovered America, and opened a new world to agriculture and commerce; Watts applied steam, and gave an impetus to all kinds of commercial and mechanical progress; Morse showed how electricity could be trained to man's uses; Stanley discovered the course of the river Congo; but more than all this was done for mankind when Samuel Hahnemann discovered and gave to the world the only law of medicinal cure in nature.

Like a stone of rare value this law had lain hidden deep down under the accumulated debris of rejected theories and valueless hypotheses, from the dawn of civilization. Here and there we see glimmerings of its reflected light, in announcements of various of the Aesculapian following.

In 420 B. C., Hippocrates teaches the use of emetics to cure vomiting. Further along in history we have Liston teaching the use of Belladonna in erysipelas. In 1768 a surgeon, Wm. Alexander, of Edinboro, made drug provings; then follows Albrecht von Haller, that earnest truth-seeker, who insisted that to obtain true knowledge of a drug it was necessary to test its action upon the healthy, not the diseased body. But not until the advent of the immortal Hahnemann was this gem

found. He brought it from obscurity and placed it in its golden setting of mature experience, high above orthodox blunderings, as a light "for the healing of all nations."

When in our active work-a-day life we are uncertain and feel discouraged, if we look up we see the sparkling of the gem, and we are strengthened and grope less in the dark after the "flesh pots of Egypt."

But how is it with the old school, do they see the gem? Yes, but its brilliant light of truth blinds their unaccustomed eyes. As with their own allopathic dogma, so they think they can appreciate the beauty of our law at a glance, but the fatal mistake drives them back to their old gropings and stumblings again. At first the truth-seeker can bear but a glance, and as his mental vision grows stronger more of this light can be borne, until its full strength is sustained without injury.

Homœopathy claims that were its principles thoroughly understood, their application would be a science. We are the students of the science of medicine; allopathy gropes in the night of the dark ages, its light is individual experience, its law the dictum of the text-books.

In the last few years England has furnished allopathy two prophets; I refer to Ringer and Phillips. The former published a work claiming to be an exponent of progressive allopathic medicine, containing a large amount of the author's originality; but in reality the cream of the work is extracted from our *materia medica*.

Dr. Phillips was formerly a homœopathic physician, or claimed to be, and knowing of Ringer's success became a renegade from homœopathy, and published a *materia medica* which was drawn from two sources: Ringer's *Therapeutics* and his own homœopathic teachings. In this work the same principles were outlined, and the author even went a step or two farther than his model, Ringer, and showed still more plainly the origin of *his* knowledge. For his effort he, like Ringer, was also given a lectureship in an allopathic college.

Both Ringer's and Phillips' work may be found upon the shelves of the allopathic profession, and their teachings are accepted as truth, *ex cathedra*.

Later still I. J. M. Goss, M.D., of Marietta, Ga., published a materia medica and numbers of his drug indications were abstracted from homœopathic sources. Further on we will hear more of him.

These are some of the means by which allopathy has made its boasted advances in the past century. Ringer and Phillips are simply samples of a large class that exists in the old school, and they are from time to time, as we have seen, and as I will further prove, dragging over into their materia medica indications for remedies and even remedies themselves.

Homœopathy is the sole source from which allopathy has obtained remedies and the art of application of drugs, that will *cure* disease. This is a sweeping assertion, but it is truth, for there is but one law for the *cure* of disease. This law, like all of Nature's laws, was not *invented* by man, but simply *discovered*; it has always existed and its operation has been going on through all time, silently and unseen, and unless drugs are applied according to this law, they will not cure; but they *may* palliate or suppress disease.*

The history of the progress of allopathy for one year illustrates its progress relatively since the beginning of the 19th century. My illustration is a record of facts culled from various journals, both homœopathic and allopathic, since October of last year, 1879. First, we will expound a little of the wisdom of I. J. M. Goss, M. D., viz.: In membranous croup he uses the acetic tincture of sanguinaria.

Hamamelis in 3 to 5 drop doses, three times daily and applied locally, is a remedy for hemorrhoids. Rheumatism following a strain or sprain of a joint, Rhus tox.

Dr. Goss states that he carries a pocket-case containing sixty-five remedies; a very suspicious circumstance, but let us read on and see what it contains, viz.:

"Aconite is one of our best remedies in most forms of inflammation and zymotic fevers." "In small and repeated doses, Aconite is one of our best antiphlogistic remedies." . . .

* This, of course, applies to therapeutics alone; the laws of hygiene act upon a different principle, and are markedly distinct from the great law that governs drug action.

In inflammatory rheumatism." "In croup and tonsillitis, it acts with promptness and certainty."

"In all fevers when the fibrine of the blood is in excess, while the corpuscles are unpoisoned and the tissue as yet intact, Aconite acts specifically."

"It seems that the condition of the nervous and arterial systems calling for this remedy, is one of tension, manifested by restlessness, anxiety, thirst, and heat." "It is also of material service in acute congestion and active hemorrhage." "In acute erysipelas and puerperal fever it has done me good service in many cases."

Shade of the long departed Diogenes! arise and tell us, is this an honest man? Not only are we suspicious of fraud, but we are certain of it. Such a history of Aconite can have but one source.

Let us see what else this pocket-case contains: "Belladonna.—Belladonna acts upon the cerebral centres, removing congestion of the head, eyes, nose, and throat, hence is valuable in many diseases. I use it in sclerotitis, ophthalmia, typho-mania, delirium, catarrh, scarlet fever, measles, and in small-pox, when there is great tendency to the head, and also in puerperal-mania, sick headache, and neuralgia about the eyes, teeth, face or head. It is indicated always by dullness of the eyes, dilated pupils, and a tendency to sleep, in threatened or existing coma."

One question, my dear sir: if Belladonna is indicated in dilated pupils, how is it oculists use Atropia to produce this condition?

"Rhus toxicodendron.—I use this in erysipelas, where the skin is of a dark red color, and there is constant itching and burning; and also in other inflammations of the skin, with these indications for its use."

"Bryonia.—This article manifests a special affinity for serous tissues. It is applicable in some cases of rheumatism of the heart, chest and other serous membranes. It relieves frontal headache extending to the occiput. It is a good remedy for dry cough and pain in the chest of a dull character."

"Nux vomica.—This is the remedy for paresis of the spinal centres, and all diseases arising therefrom. In colic, if the

tongue is broad and pale, showing inaction of the stomach and liver, then *Nux vomica* is the remedy." "Where there is constipation from a deficient innervation to the rectum, then *Nux vomica* will overcome it in a few days." "In dyspepsia of whiskey and tobacco users."

"*Ipecac.*—*Ipecac.* has an elective affinity for mucous tissues; it is a valuable remedy in nausea and vomiting, where the tongue is elongated, contracted and pointed; it is a remedy in diarrhea and dysentery. With *Aconite* I use it in pneumonia of infants, especially if nausea is present."

"*Phytolacca.*—This is a polycryst, having an affinity for several tissues, and acting upon the glandular system." (Query: where did he get the term, polycryst? this is the first time I have ever known allopathy to use it; with us it is a current expression.) "It is a specific in mammary irritation and inflammation." "It has been used with success in diphtheria and nurses sore mouth. It is indicated by the leaden colored tongue, with slick glutinous coating on it. It is a remedy for some cases of acute rheumatism."

"*Macrofis Racemosa.*—*Cimicifuga* has special affinity for the uterus and the serous and fibrous tissues. In rheumatism it may be given successfully, especially where the muscles are involved. In small doses I frequently give it to prevent the false pains prior to confinement in pregnant females."

"*Gelsemium.*—To allay spasms it has no superior." "It is indicated by flushed face."

These are some of the remedies found in the pocket-case of a man who claims to practice allopathy, and these are some of the symptomatic indications for their use.

Symptomatic indications! what right has he to talk of symptoms? Allopathy claims to generalize, and laughs at homoeopathic symptomatology. Have a care, my friends; the pillar of cloud is not reversed, but you are getting among the Israelites.

Our truth-seeker, of whom we have just been speaking, also uses Iodide of Arsenic in hay fever, "if the discharge from the nose is acrid." And in strangury he gives *Cantharides*, *Cannabis sativa*, and *Apis mellifica*.

These examples of "originality" were taken from the *Medi-*

ed Brief, an allopathic periodical, claiming the largest circulation of any similar publication. Such productions are not criticised, but eagerly read and adopted by the subscribers to this journal.

Here are some additional examples of allopathic homœopathy, from various sources:—Gelsemium is given in cerebro-spinal meningitis and in trigeminal neuralgia. Cannabis sat. for gonorrhœa. Terebinthina is used in miasmatic hæmaturia. Berberis vulgaris for biliary calculi. Willow charcoal—Carbo veg.—recommended for dyspepsia; coffee proscribed while using. Guarana or Paullinia sorbillis for sick headache. Cannabis indica in epilepsy.

"The *Medical Record*, Extra," June 14th, 1880, says of our Hepar sulphuris calcarea:—"Calcium Sulphide is very valuable in skin lesions attended with suppuration. In *acne* of a pustular form, in hordeolum and boils it is useful; it not only relieves the symptoms, but prevents further crops of boils." The dose recommended is the tenth of a grain, *i. e.*, our first decimal potency.

Arsenic; cardiac disease:—An English physician, Dr. Lockie, after speaking of other troubles for which arsenic is used, says: "it seems to be of greater value even in fatty degeneration, and this in spite of the fact that recent experiments tend to show that fatty degeneration of the heart is one of the results of feeding animals with arsenical preparations." Arsenic is also highly recommended in the treatment of asthma.

Why is it that these gentlemen fight under the standard: "contraria contrariis curantur," instead of "similia similibus curantur?" Why ignore the theory of the law of cure, and apply it in actual practice? Is this consistent with truth-seeking?

But the above is no more inconsistent than the following from the *Medical Brief*:—"There is nothing more absurd and disastrous in its results than to treat all cases of puerperal fever upon one and the same principle." In substance, specific treatment is wrong; very good; but hear his contradiction: "If any of the readers of the *Brief* have a *specific treatment* (the italics are mine) for this much dreaded malady, I would be glad to hear from them."

Caulephyllum is recommended in arresting threatened, premature labor, and also "in controlling abdominal pain during the last months of pregnancy." A doctor uses nitrite of amyl in congestive chills, a sthenic condition, and a colleague uses it in faintness, which is pre-eminently asthenic. How apply contraria to this? The two conditions are irreconcilable.

Ipecac. is used in uterine hemorrhage, and Aconite is endorsed in pneumonia. The latter remedy is also administered for facial neuralgia, tic douloureux, "the dose is $\frac{1}{10}$ of a grain of aconitin."

Belladonna.—Useful for spasms of involuntary muscles, and also for dilating the os uteri.

In Braithwaite's Retrospect the (so-called) treatment of syphilis without mercury is recommended; but homœopathy is not denied the privilege of forming an opinion whether mercury did or did not, at least, assist in the cure. The writer says: "*Hot baths were the order of the day for all cases of syphilis.*" "Such local applications as black wash, calomel, red precipitate, or citrine ointment, do not in the least degree, in my opinion, diminish the value of the cases cured without the specific action of mercury. In my cases the actual amount of mercury imbibed by the system must have been very small, indeed; the remedies were not at all pushed, quite the contrary; and any one who could attribute to their use the good results which followed, must be a believer in the Hahnemannian doctrine of infinitesimal doses."

Allopathy must accept this man's dictum or be stigmatized; fortunately *we* do not mind such a stigma; we are proud of the distinction.

Aloes in $\frac{1}{2}$ grain doses is recommended for hemorrhoids, and in a subsequent number of the journal containing this suggestion, another gentleman advises the remedy in smaller doses, viz.: "He will obtain speedier curative results, without aggravating the disease, if he gives one-tenth or one-twentieth of a grain at a time." This is progress unmistakably; these gentlemen are certainly trenching upon our ground.

Ferruginous salts when given to cure a case of hemorrhage, only increased the flow. Possibly homœopathy can explain this *strange phenomenon* (?) better than allopathy.

Here is a sample of orthodox treatment:—"As for the treatment, I think Dr. Barclay and friends did all that could be done: their treatment was most excellent; they gave the child calomel, Dover's powder, potassii bromide, rhubarb, santonine, bromidia, castor oil, turpentine, quinia, cold to the head, and finally veratrum. But despite all, it died in two days. Now the question is, could anything more have been done? I think not.

The doctor says: 'Now what was the cause of the condition in which I found my patient Sunday morning?' The question, 'what was the cause of its condition?' is of great importance. Now, I hardly know what to say was the cause, unless it was that the poor little three-year-old child hardly got enough medicine in the forty-eight hours of its illness to relieve the great prostration caused by the cerebral condition and convulsions." This is a specimen of orthodox routine treatment, in the year 1879.

Once more I quote from I. J. M. Goss, M. D.: "The tormina and tenesmus were severe, and the child much reduced, as it had been sick for some time, I put it on Ringer's preparation of corrosive sublimate, one grain to one pint of water, only reduced the dose to suit the age of the child." This is between the third and fourth decimal dilution. Further on he remarks: "I have used it now for two seasons, whenever it was indicated, which is in all discharges resembling the washings of flesh, etc. All remedies have their place, and each one has the effect when indicated."

The *Hahnemannian* for Feb. 1880, says: "Dr. Murrell of the Westminster Hospital reports in the *Western Lancet* having used Dover's powder in fifty-five cases of night-sweating in phthisis, with relief in all cases but five. This report excites the *Medical Tribune* to the profound remark that 'the use of a sudorific to check sweating may seem paradoxical.' If the *Tribune* and the *Lancet* could only recognize the existence of a principle in nature under which all disordered actions can be similarly relieved, their patients would have cause to sing a paradology."

Pulsatilla is used in dysmenorrhœa and in headache from

mental application, and the author of this assertion states that "no such power is attributed to it in books to which I have access." This then, is another "original discovery." What nonsense! why does he not come out with the manly acknowledgement that this was stolen from homœopathy?—how else came allopathy by it? We have known and applied such facts for years.

Belladonna and Drosera are administered in whooping cough.

Salicylic acid has served its term, is getting "old fashioned," and a new remedy is supplanting it: Mamea, so our friends say, "is as much a specific for rheumatism as quinine for malarial poisoning." So they said of Salicylic acid; but it seems, the bubble burst.

Another specific, for *chronic* rheumatism, has been discovered: Senecio aureus. "If perseveringly administered" it "will give relief." *But*, to make more certain, it is combined with phytolacca decandra, it then becomes, so say our friends, "the king of restoratives in rheumatic affections." Baptisia tinctoria.—"In typhoid, when the diarrhoea supervenes and the discharges are peculiarly offensive, and their color resembling prune juice, then baptisia plays a part to be remembered by the practitioner."

This seems to be another new discovery; so the sphere of baptisia is typhoid fever? Verily, if we do not see to it our house will be tumbling about our ears; another prop gone, another illusion proved; we were really presumptuous enough to think *we* originated the scientific application of baptisia.

Lillium tigrinum "is one of our best remedies in cervical leucorrhœa." Pulsatilla is also recommended for leucorrhœa.

Allopathy repudiates dynamization; potentized drugs are to it a myth. Allopathy and materialism are therefore, necessarily convertible terms. Here at least we expect to find consistency, but it is not so. In a system without a law, inconsistencies and contradictions abound. To illustrate my point I have culled the following:—"I used the Kidder battery two years; it failed me, and finally I came to the conclusion that the current was too *crude*, the discharge was too *coarse*. It was given off in *too large molecules*; needed to be *attenuated*." (The italics are mine). Then, if this be true, how about crude drugs?

Which is the cruder, molecules of electricity from a Kidder battery, or molecules of a drug tincture? If it is necessary to *attenuate* electricity, why give drugs crude?

The *Homoeopathic Times* quotes the following from the *Medical Record*: "No one can fail to have noticed the increased therapeutic range which has of late been given to many standard drugs by simply varying their dosage. We have, indeed, had our *Materia Medica* enlarged almost as much in this way as by the actual addition of new remedies. The extension has been made both by increasing and diminishing the ordinary dosage, and in each case new effects have been produced. It is perhaps in *calomel*, *strychnine*, and *Potish salts* that a different, or greater power in very large doses, is best illustrated. The employment of minute doses on the other hand, has been more extended and has produced more striking results. Thus the use of *Podophyllin*, in infantile diarrhœa, of *Arsenic* in gastric irritation, of *Ipecac.* as an anti-emetic, of *Pilocarpin* and *Dover's powder* and *Turkish baths*, in night sweats, of *Cantharides* in urethral irritations and hematuria, are all notable extensions of the therapeutic range of the particular drug.

Of course such examples as these are eagerly held up by enthusiasts as proofs of a grand therapeutic law. It hardly needs argument, however, to show that they do not indicate either a law or a uniform series of facts. There are but few drugs that have even this peculiar range which we have described, and those do not, as a rule, show their best results in their minimum dose. We doubt if *Arsenic* ever became popular in gastritis, or *Pilocarpin* in night sweats, while *Ipecac.* is a most unreliable anti-emetic. We need not look for any great therapeutic triumphs, therefore, in the *similia similibus* action of the drop posology. There is a physiological law that substances which at first irritate inhibitory centres, when more energetically given will paralyze them; or, what at first constricts a tissue, may later relax and destroy it. There is nothing very new in this law; the only novelty is that we are learning of more agents, which when given in a certain way illustrate it. These new facts in regard to minute dosage are suggestive and often useful, but they indicate no mysterious nor unusual law."

This line of reasoning, I presume, satisfactorily disposes this theory of ours, this old physiological law that we have clothed in a new garb and revamped as a newly discovered law; completely demolishes homœopathy in the eyes of allopathy. But we think not; our hydra's heads are all of them still intact. Generalization is the bane of allopathy.

Why not be more definite? There are all kinds of nausea; emesis results from a variety of causes.

Arsenic will only cure its own peculiar gastritis, and so on through the whole materia medica.

A specific, as our friends use the term, will never be found for any one disease; this they have yet to learn.

They reason as far as materialism allows, here they stop; they can go no farther.

Like Moses they behold the "promised land" afar off, but they can not enter. They have irreverently struck the rock of truth and this is their reward. The land of milk and honey is for their children, the blessing is not theirs.

An allopath, while attending a case of obstetrics, gave the patient through mistake 20 drops of the fluid extract of digitalis, intending to give that amount of ergot. Finding his patient improve and recover without any bad results, he experimented with digitalis, and concluded that in inertia uteri especially, does it act as an ocytotic. He ends by saying he has no theory to advance. Why not? Simply because there is no law governing, and no principle in the application of drugs in such a manner.

Such is a system without a law, a therapeia founded on experimentation.

In pathology, in physiology, in religion, in astronomy, the *vis a tergo* that governs, is one of nature's laws; but medicine alone is governed by the laws of chance.

Is it not rational to suppose that if in nature there is a law governing the universe, and each combination of circumstances that form a system or science, that a principle, a law should govern the action of drugs?

The answer from the domain of practical, common sense is, yes. Then why do men neglect its investigation?

Homœopathy is as free to the medical profession as were the waters of Jordan to the Jews.

Ye who claim to be liberal-minded, scientific physicians, why stand afar off? If the theories of allopathy are so far superior to all others, why need ye fear to investigate a system so innocuous as ours?

One of your recognized and revered leaders, now deceased, when he was an old man, said that were he a young man he would study homœopathy and see for himself if it contained truth, and he believed it would be a wise thing for every physician to do. That man was Prof. N. R. Smith. Are there any in the ranks of allopathy to-day, who have a stronger character than he had? Such a statement, therefore, originated in no weak or immature mind.

As we have frequently said before, we do not object to allopathy adopting our particular methods of preparing drugs, or any new idea it may fancy; but we claim as a just royalty that credit be given us for its origin, discovery or invention.

Plagiarism and theft are twin sisters.

The American Pharmaceutical Association has suggested that "a new class of prescriptions of very general usefulness" be introduced, "particularly in the case of powerful remedies, which are prescribed in very small quantities so as to be exactly weighed only with difficulty, namely: *attenuated triturations to be prepared by triturating one part of the substance with nine parts of sugar of milk* (the italics are mine), and to dispense *only* these dilutions when the substances are prescribed." This the *Homœopathic Times* extracted from the "Report on the Revision of the U. S. Pharmacopia," page 38.

Triturations and attenuations have been scouted by the allopaths for so long that this startles us, it looks like a symptom of insanity, or if not, then it is a concession to homœopathy without due acknowledgement. Presuming the latter to be the case, have we not a right to show indignation at such a procedure?

Such things are quietly done and we are informed that homœopathy has not influenced medical progress; it is a nonentity. These men are scientists (?) and work only for the good of humanity (?); therefore we have no redress.

One of the progressive scientists, when he is uncertain in his diagnosis of typhoid or intermittent fever, adopts this course, viz: "I make quinine in five to ten grain doses differentiate for me. If after the use of said remedy, I am unable to note a decided remission, I say remittent fever. If my quinine aggravates symptoms, I drop at once to a simple expectant treatment and call it typhoid fever."

If this is a specimen of progressive, scientific medicine, let us eschew medicine, "throw physic to the dogs." If after all the years of transmitted, accumulated knowledge, we must resort to this method of diagnosis, let us give up all pretense to being scientific healers, and add mountebank to the title M.D.

Progress in the "regular" school of medicine has certainly not been rapid. This fact is clearly and copiously illustrated by Prof. S. A. Jones in his lectures upon the "Grounds of a Homeopath's Faith."* It is a notorious fact that "regular" practitioners are dissatisfied with the result of the application of drugs.

Dr. Jno. Syre Bristowe, Physician to St. Thomas' Hospital, says, "that in a very large proportion of cases all the nicely balanced combinations of drugs which are administered in the forms of pills and potions, might for any good they do, as well be thrown to the dogs." This he utters in the year A. D. 1880.

Another malcontent complains: "Medicines disappoint us all in a large majority of cases, and yet we give medicine, and wherefore? It is because the patients and friends demand it, or is it because we hope to succeed better than our predecessors? Be that as it may, we keep on in the old paths, frequently trying experiments with new remedies and new ways of giving old ones, and yet failure is written largely on every page of our books."

Here is a still more emphatic expression of scepticism: "As heretofore remarked, I am one of those that believe that medicine has been one of the greatest scourges of humanity, ranking with war, pestilence and famine, and yet that when shorn of excrescences, it will be one of the greatest blessings."

* Published in pamphlet form and for sale at the Hom. Pharmacies.

We think it about time this shearing had produced some good result; 20 centuries is sufficient time to prove any system. Old fogysim must concoct a more powerful compound than any solvent of excrecences it has yet prepared. I am afraid that if "the last man" happens to be this doctor of allopathy, and the end of his existence could be prolonged 2000 years hence, he would die still bewailing the want of this same undiscovered excrecence solvent, if he depended upon discovering a remedy within the pale of his own particular pathy.

Dr. Bens, a member of the Royal Academy of Medicine, of Belgium, writes as follows:—

"Our allopathy is no longer medicine, so-called, but medico-chemistry, pure and simple. I have never seen physicians use and abuse the most violent drugs as they do at the present time. This routine in my opinion assumes the proportion of a real public calamity, and I could enumerate numerous facts, if I wished, to prove that the unfortunate patients of the present day succumb under the weight of the officinal and magisterial preparations administered to them. And I am free to declare that if allopathy continues to march in the steps of the chemists, at a pace which it is going, it will end by decimating humanity."

Thus we find allopathic inefficiency and harmfulness is proved by its own disciples: it is therefore unnecessary to draw proof from other sources.

Allopathy, as I have said, simply skins the surface of the *materia medica*. Its disciples' interpretation of drug manifestations differ widely: A case of infantile convulsions in which Calomel, Rhubarb, Veratrum, Santonine, Opium, etc., were given, and death ensuing, the attending physician inquires of his colleagues the cause of the condition just prior to death and following the drugging. One wiseacre informs him that enough was not done, another that the symptoms of Santonine in Wood's Therapeutics will show the cause, and a third answers without hesitancy, "*Veratrum*."

Now, what say our "scientists;" is this a specimen of the "scientific" treatment practiced by their venerable school of medicine? Is this a part of the erudition transmitted from

the hoary headed patriarchs of the only "regular" school of medicine to their illustrious and progressive descendants? Or, is it the result of *progress* since Hippocrates was an infant?

Is it possible they have worked and studied, and observed physiological drug action, and made chemical analyses for more than two thousand years, with such a result?

Is allopathy no more able to explain the action of drugs which it is daily prescribing, than we must believe from what we know?

A system (so-called) without a law, yet it dares sneer at and ridicule a system founded upon a universal law of God. Because some of its followers make blunders and are unworthy representatives of so sublime a cause, allopathy constitutes itself a judge and condemns the law for the fault of the individual.

Homœopathy is less than a century old, but with our law to guide us, did we know so little of drug indications, the power of legislation should be invoked to forbid us the right to practice medicine.

We offer allopathy the same boon we possess, simply for the asking; but she shuts her eyes and turns away with a sigh of unbelief, like the muck-raker in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." If he would but look up the crown is his; but no, muck is more real and materialistic, therefore he only grovels on as he has always done time immemorial.

We have shown some of the inconsistencies and confusion in the ranks of allopathy, and we have also shown that a large share of real progress is due to the benign influence of the law of similars; let us now inquire "what of the hour" in the citadel of homœopathy.

The first advance we notice is the appointment to public office of homœopathic physicians, in a number of states. This shows progress, marked progress, in the public mind: the people not only tolerate our system, but it is publicly honored, in fact, publicly preferred to allopathy in some localities.

In New York, Gov. Cornell has appointed a homœopathic physician to the position of surgeon-general of the state.

In Princeton, Ills., a homœopath holds the positions of town physician and secretary of the board of health.

Dr. J. H. Gallinger, of Concord, N. H., politically honored by the presidency of the senate of his state, has recently been appointed surgeon-general of the same.

In Rhode Island a homœopath has been re-elected surgeon-general of the state.

Dr. C. W. Breyfogle has been elected a member of the state board of health in California.

In Woodland City, Cal., a homœopath was elected member of the city board of health, Dec. 26th, 1879.

T. P. Wilson, M.D., President of the American Institute of Homœopathy, and J. P. Dake, M.D., chairman of the bureau of materia medica in the same institution, were elected members of the American Public Health Association, at its last annual meeting.

The same association rejected Dr. T. S. Verdi's application for membership only a few years ago. Surely the world *does* move.

As I have before mentioned we have eleven homœopathic medical colleges. The majority of these colleges have heretofore adopted the two years' course of lectures; but now eight of them advise and have arranged for a three years' graded course, while one, the Boston University, has provided for a graded course of *four* years, and in the University of Michigan Hom. Med. College no student is allowed to graduate unless he attend three full terms of nine months each. Heretofore this college has not had a full teaching corps, but the attendance has been so large that the Regents of the college decided to appoint a full corps of professors, and also enlarge the college building. Thus about 81 per cent. of the whole number of colleges have raised their standard of medical education.

What percentage of allopathic institutions have taken this step?

Time was when a thorough medical education could only be obtained at an allopathic school, but that time is now past. The facilities at our colleges are equal to those of the old school; we do not even except surgery.

The University of Maryland, medical department, stands as one of the best in the land, but to-day there exists no operative surgical class for students, while at the Hahnemann college, in Philadelphia, ever since 1874, six years ago, such a class has existed, where students are allowed to practice all ordinary and some rare operations upon the cadaver. When a student graduated from the allopathic college mentioned, he did *not* know practically how to apply a bandage; when he received his diploma from the Hahnemann college he was practically familiar with operative surgery.

Which school is in the van of progress?

Several new hospitals have been established: one at Cleveland, O.; one also at Detroit, Mich.; and at Buffalo, N. Y., a Homœopathic Eye and Ear Infirmary. Philadelphia has in anticipation a new hospital. "Wm. Thaw, Esq., Pittsburg's most liberal citizen, has offered \$25,000 towards a Homœopathic hospital."

In Norfolk, Va., there is a homœopathic free dispensary. The homœopathic hospital of Michigan University was dedicated March 12th, 1880.

A new lectureship on Histology and Morbid Anatomy has been created in the Hahnemann college of Philadelphia. At Stillwater, Minn., the city hospital has given one ward for the exclusive use of homœopathic treatment.

Dr. A. B. DeVilleneuve, a homœopathic physician of New Orleans, has had a gold medal awarded him by France for his devoted services during the yellow fever epidemic of 1878.

Some of the old school journals have stated that the homœopathic physicians all left Memphis during this epidemic. I will take this opportunity to vindicate our school of such dastardly conduct, by quoting a letter of Dr. T. J. Quimby's that appeared in the Investigator of March 1st, 1880:—"I would state that the Memphis homœopaths are amply able to defend themselves against any aspersions however unjustly cast and from whatever source originating. When the epidemic of 1878 broke out, there were practicing in Memphis four Homœopaths, Drs. J. G. Malcolm, L. D. Mosse, L. V. Buddeke and myself. Dr. Malcolm was a comparatively new comer to the

city and was in so much doubt as regards the location that he had never moved his family from the North. Upon the approach of the epidemic everything presented such a gloomy outlook to him that he concluded to abandon the field. Drs. Morse and Buddeke attended to business promptly and faithfully until taken sick and physically unable to do anything more. They were both under my personal care and as soon as able to travel left the city upon my advice. As regards myself I was blessed with health, remained during the entire epidemic, and attended faithfully to professional duties." So after all, our enemy's exultation proves to have been "much ado about nothing."

In Marshall Co., Iowa, and in the adjoining counties, the number of homœopathic physicians has doubled in the last three years.

Throughout the Union, progress in various forms is taking place. I do not pretend to say that this is all the advance homœopathy has made in the last year in the U. S., but I give it as a fair illustration, as a symptom of the health of homœopathy, and for our encouragement to work harder, and as individuals further the progress of our system to our utmost ability.

At the last annual meeting of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of the State of Maryland, its president, among other remarks made the following: "We are always ready to accept practical results of investigations in any direction, even though the explanation of such may not be conclusive.

It may be said, in brief, that the science of medicine of to-day has emerged completely from the obscurities of the past."

From this last remark we infer that this august and self-satisfied body considers itself to have at last arrived into the light of the perfect day of medical science. These gentlemen are scientists.

Then they have a law: no science ever existed without one, but, (and this is a great wall like the rock of Gibraltar) they cannot demonstrate its existence.

Medical *science* explains the curative action of all drugs upon one and the same law.

One question, my friends, as a test—and it is the crucial test: explain the action of that large group of drugs you call alteratives?

This question was asked years ago, and these scientists (?) have never yet solved it.

Our final verdict is, from what we know, that this ancient school of medicine teaches no science and never can. It teaches a system founded upon experimentation and empiricism.

Humanity has accepted its dictum long enough, a law is slowly but surely taking its place. It is merely a question of time when allopathy will be but a name.

“We are always ready to accept practical results of investigations in any direction, even though the explanation of such may not be conclusive.”

Allopathy here throws down the gauntlet, we unhesitatingly take it up. I quote from an extract of a letter from Dr. Wm. Boericke in the *Hahnemannian* for Sept., 1880, viz.: “I had the pleasure of attending the meeting of the Homœopathic Central Verein of Germany. One of the most interesting events of that meeting was the report of Dr. Zöpritz about Prof. Jäger’s experiments with his neural apparatus. Though a full account will be published by the Professor himself, I will give you the facts as presented to the society. It seems that Prof. Jäger has been experimenting upon the length of time required by the brain to receive impressions, and how this interval is affected by various odors. The results are interesting and curious, and led Dr. Schlegel, of Stuttgart, to persuade Prof. Jäger to try the effect of inhaling homœopathic dilutions, and see whether these small quantities thus taken could affect his ‘neurometer.’ Now Prof. Jäger has hitherto been an active opponent of homœopathy; but for the sake of perfecting his experiments in every direction he acquiesced, and selected Aconite 3d, 30th, and 200th.

The normal time required in Prof. Jäger’s case was 90 to 100 mille seconds. In order to distinguish the action of Aconite from that of the alcohol, the latter was tested alone; but no material change was made in the intervals as recorded by the ‘neurometer.’

When Aconite 3d was inhaled, the rapidity of perception increased, *i. e.*, the interval was shortened. And what is remarkable, it grew in intensity as the higher potencies were inhaled, so that when the 200th was tried, Prof. Jäger sent for Dr. Schlegel, and acknowledged that he was 'dumbfounded.' He said that he was positive that the result could not possibly be due to any other influence than that of Aconite 200, as the experiment was conducted with the greatest care, and resulted the same when others tried it. I have seen the diagnostic tracings of the 'neurometer,' showing the impressions made by the different potencies, and they are certainly very interesting."

Two months later (Nov.) the same journal publishes a letter written by the inventor of the "neurometer;" the following extract from it shows Prof. Jäger to be a seeker after truth, and not ashamed to acknowledge error for the sake of a principle: "The mathematically constant and most readily observed increase of the drug, developed through potentization, raises Homœopathy by one stroke to the rank of an exact physiologically-based method of cure, of equal birthright with allopathy."

To the "Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of the State of Maryland," as a fair representative of allopathy, being governed as all such associations should be, by the soul of honor, and recognizing itself as a body of scientists, greeting:—

Know ye by this salutation that we do ask you to accept this "practical result of investigation," nay, we demand that you consider this fact and all the truth with which it is pregnant.

No one fact has been discovered that is so significant. What else can allopathy do but accept the truth of the dynamization theory, which is no longer a theory, but a demonstrated fact?

I challenge the entire allopathic profession to read the following works thoroughly and carefully in the spirit of truth-seeking men, and then continue the practice of allopathy as conscientious healers of the sick:—"The Law of Cure," by Charles Neidhard, M.D.; "Dunsford's Homœopathy;" this work is out of print and copies are therefore difficult to obtain; I do not, in consequence, insist upon this book being read. "The Grounds of a Homœopath's Faith," by Samuel A. Jones, M.D.; "The Homœopathic Law of Similarity," by Dr. von Grauvogl; "Manual of Thera-

peutics" and "Manual of Pharmacodynamics," in two volumes, by Richard Hughes M.D.; and lastly,* when these works have been thoroughly read, Hahnemann's "Organon of Homœopathic Medicine."

When these works have been studied, not one or two, but all of them, then you may say you have investigated the principles of homœopathy. I mention them in the order in which they should be read, do not, therefore, begin at the end or middle of the list, but at the beginning. A large number of allopathic physicians have read Hooker's "Medical Delusions" and think they know all about homœopathy. But think a moment; would you advise a medical student to investigate allopathy by reading a homœopath's explanation of the system? You would advise Wood, Flint, and various other authorities. Then apply the same rule to this case; read the works of homœopathic authors for a correct exposition of homœopathy and you will only do justice, you will only be observing the golden rule.

Allopathy has insisted, and still continues in its endeavors to convince the laity, that homœopathy is but a feeble invalid, in fact, that it is dying. Having given such information as we could gain upon this subject, we ask you to deny the assertion.

If the future of our law of cure is as brilliant as its progress in the past leads us to believe it will be, then as we have prophesied, allopathy will indeed soon be but a name.

Throughout all the land disease will be stayed, life will be lengthened and a physical millennium will draw nigh. Medical colleges will have no distinctive title of sect, and the true law of cure only will be taught.

Our observations have been made, our facts stated, and we leave them with you for the consideration they deserve.
